

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAP AMERICA, INC. ET AL.

Petitioner

v.

Patent of VERSATA DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC.

Patent Owner

Case CBM2012-00001

Patent 6,553,350

PATENT OWNER VERSATA'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
EXHIBIT LIST	x
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	2
III. STATEMENT IDENTIFYING MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE.....	2
IV. STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY CLAIMS 17 AND 26-29 OF THE ‘350 PATENT ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101	3
A. Applicable Law -- Patent-Eligible Subject Matter Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	3
1. Section 101 statutory categories and judicial exceptions	3
2. Claim interpretation and considering claim as a whole.....	5
3. Abstract ideas	7
4. Practical application of an abstract idea	8
5. Preemption	11
6. Machine-or-transformation test	12
B. Claim 17 recites patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	13
1. The subject matter of claim 17.....	13
2. The “method” of claim 17 is a statutory “process” under § 101.....	15
3. Claim 17 is not directed to an abstract idea.....	16
a) Claim 17 must be considered as a whole in determining whether it is or is not directed to an abstract idea	16
b) Claim 17 is directed to a specific, practical and advantageous way to determine a product price using hierarchical groups of customers and products	18
4. Versata’s claim 17 does not preempt any abstract idea.....	26

5.	The method of claim 17 satisfies the machine-or-transformation test.....	27
C.	Claim 26 recites patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	31
1.	The subject matter of claim 26.....	31
2.	The “computer readable storage media” of claim 26 is a statutory “machine” and “article of manufacture” under § 101.....	31
3.	Claim 26 is not directed to an abstract idea.....	32
D.	Claim 27 recites patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	34
1.	The subject matter of claim 27.....	34
2.	The “computer implemented method” of claim 27 is a statutory “process” under § 101	35
3.	Claim 27 is not directed to an abstract idea.....	36
4.	Versata’s claim 27 does not preempt any abstract idea.....	38
5.	The “computer implemented method” of claim 27 satisfies the machine-or-transformation test.....	38
E.	Claim 28 recites patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	39
1.	The subject matter of claim 28.....	39
2.	The “computer readable storage media” of claim 28 is a statutory “article of manufacture” under § 101	39
3.	Claim 28 is not directed to an abstract idea.....	40
F.	Claim 29 recites patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	42
1.	The subject matter of claim 29.....	42
2.	The “apparatus” of claim 29 is a statutory “machine” under § 101.....	43
3.	Claim 29 is not directed to an abstract idea.....	43
4.	Claim 29 satisfies the machine-or-transformation test.....	44

G.	Claims 17 and 26-29 recite patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101	45
H.	Evidence that SAP withheld from the Board and its witness Dr. Siegel further supports the determination that claims 17 and 26-29 recite patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	49
I.	The Board’s claim construction	51
1.	The “sorting” step of claim 17 is performed after the “retrieving” step	52
2.	The broadest reasonable interpretation standard is not applicable in this proceeding and thus the Board should apply the District Court’s claim construction for which both SAP and Versata advocated.....	61
3.	The modified claim construction further supports the patent-eligibility of claims 17 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	66
J.	The testimony of SAP’s witness Dr. Siegel should be given no weight	67
V.	CONCLUSION.....	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brogdex Co.</i> , 283 U.S. 1 (1931).....	32, 40
<i>Aro Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., Inc.</i> , 365 U.S. 336 (1961).....	6, 15
<i>Arrhythmia Research Tech., Inc. v. Corazonix Corp.</i> , 958 F.2d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	5, 9, 34, 42
<i>Bancorp Services, L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10, 11, 48, 51
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	passim
<i>Burr v. Duryee</i> , 68 U.S. (1 Wall.) 531 (1863)	8
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20, 46
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980).....	3
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	passim
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	60
<i>Fort Properties v. American Master Lease</i> , 671 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	7, 11, 13

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.